

# MONTGOMERY COUNTY

817 SILVER SPRING AVENUE  
SUITE 300



LOCAL 1664

# FIRE FIGHTERS ASS'N.

SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND 20910  
PHONE: 588-2161

2453/Comm 5/25

76 MAY 24 PM 2:44

17 May 1976

COUNCIL OFFICE

Montgomery County Council  
County Office Building  
Rockville, Maryland

Dear Council Member,

Bill #11-76 as introduced on 6 April 1976 is totally unacceptable to my Association. I am sure that after you review this bill you will agree that Mr. Gleason is offering very little, dues check-off and meetings, and in return is asking the employee groups to surrender a great deal.

In June 1975, I submitted a letter on a similar bill suggesting a number of amendments to bring the bill in line with 20th century labor relations thought. Again we find ourselves faced with a bill based on 18th century labor thought, so again I am offering a list of amendments to Bill 11-76. I must stress that the amendments will only make this bill acceptable, we need a good collective bargaining bill.

1. Line 6 - Place a period after "grievances" and omit line 7 and the word "meetings" on line 8. Since this is a meet

*An ounce of Fire Prevention may save Your Life!*

and confir bill, there should be no topics that can not be discussed. The meetings will not result in binding action so why not open discussions?

2. Line 15 - Omit the words "Chief Administrative Office" and replace them with an impartial committee apointed by the County Council. No discussions can be productive if one party has veto power.
3. After Line 23 and the following paragraph; It is the intent of this bill to be the first step in establishing a meaningfull collective bargaining relationship employees and Montgomery County.

33-63

4. Line 38 - Remove the words "The term 'employee' does not include," and remove all of line 39. I will offer justification later in this letter.
5. Line 58 - Place a period after the word "policy" and omit rest of line and all of line 59. This line would exclude almost all employees as all employees by nature of their employment implement County policy.
6. Line 63 to line 70 omit in its entirity. This is much too broad a definition.
7. Line 78 - Omit the words "assign work, reward or discipline." Omit lines 79, 80, and 81. This definition would include the lowest supervisory level employees. These people do not have a direct affect on policy and thus would be unrepresented under this definition. Let the employees decide if

they wish to be members of an employee group.

33-64

8. Line 99 - Place a period after the word "organization" and omit lines 100 and 101. Add the following; All the employees in a specific classification represented by an employee group, but not members of that, shall be required to pay a monthly service fee to the employee group not to exceed 3/4 of the groups monthly dues. This service fee will be with-held by the County and paid to the employee group.

33-65

9. Omit paragraph "A", lines 103 thru 108. The employees should decide the composition of their own groups.
10. Line 120 - Omit all beginning with the word "No" and the following line numbers 121 and 122. Let the employees decide if they need representation.
11. Line 127 - Omit the word "Sergeant" and replace it with the words Chief Officer. My group is already made up of many officers above Sergeant. These men feel that they need representation. Would you deny them what they need? As Chief Gratz has stated in his book "Fire Department Management: Scope and Method" it is not possible .. "to establish a management level catagory by simply relating to a rank title." We feel that the membership cut off should be at the level of those who make policy.

33-69

12. Omit paragraph "B", lines 221 thru 223. Why exclude any

topics? The resulting Position Paper would not be binding on the parties involved.

33-73

13. Omit paragraph "D", lines 277 thru 280. Since the bill offers no binding arbitration or other binding remedies in the event of disagreement, I feel that my Association can not surrender any of its options.

As you can see I have asked for substantial changes in this bill, but I feel that these changes are necessary to make this bill acceptable. We need a workable Labor Relations Bill. Please give us one we can live with.

Very truly yours,



Thomas E. Finnin,  
First Vice President

By direction of  
John M. Hardy,  
President

JMH/cfz

Mr. Thomas E. Finnin  
Montgomery County Fire Fighters Assn.  
817 Silver Spring Avenue, Suite 300  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Dear Mr. Finnin:

We appreciate receiving your recent letter offering your Association's amendments to Bill 11-76, the County Executive's proposal authorizing a "meet and confer" approach to employer/employee relations.

When Bill 11-76 was introduced on April 6, 1976, I, too, expressed my concern about some of its provisions and suggested that amendments to the bill or an alternate bill be prepared. Subsequently, the Montgomery County Employees Association asked me to introduce a bill which they had prepared and I did so on June 15, 1976 (copy of Bill 23-76 enclosed for your information).

Although Bill 23-76 provides an alternative to 11-76, I believe that other amendments may be necessary. However, we are most interested in receiving employees' views on both proposals and have scheduled a public hearing on Bills 11 and 23-76 for Wednesday, July 14, 1976 at 8 p.m. If you or your association would like to be placed on the Speakers' List, please call the Council office at 279-1231. In the meantime, I have included your letter of May 17 in the public record of Bill 11-76.

Sincerely,

Norman L. Christeller  
President

POS/cbr

Enclosure

